

19
T H E
INFANT'S CAUSE PLEADED;

OR, THE RITE OF

INFANT BAPTISM DEFENDED.

BEING THE
SUBSTANCE OF A DISCOURSE

DELIVERED AT

Lady Huntingdon's Chapel at Lewes,

On JANUARY 22, 1786,

By S. BARNARD.

TOGETHER WITH

Some REMARKS on the Rev. JOSEPH MIDDLETON'S
LETTERS.

SUFFER THE LITTLE CHILDREN TO COME UNTO ME,
AND FORBID THEM NOT, FOR OF SUCH IS THE KINGDOM
OF GOD.

MARK X. 14.

MAKE NO FRIENDSHIP WITH AN ANGRY MAN.

PROV. XXII. 24.

L O N D O N:

PRINTED BY SAMMELLS & RITCHIE, NO. 11,
ALBION-BUILDINGS, BARTHOLOMEW-CLOSE.

ADVERTISEMENT.

*I*N order to lay before the Reader my Reason for publishing the following Pages, I have to inform him, that on the 15th of January last I was called upon to baptize two Children, of which I gave public Notice; knowing that the Minds of some of my Hearers were perplexed about that Subject. When therefore the Time came, I spoke my Thoughts freely, without designing to give Offence to any one. But I soon found it had a contrary Effect; for the Sunday after a long Harangue was delivered at the Anabaptist Meeting in the Cliffe, by the Rev. J. Middleton, wherein he shewed his great Displeasure at what he was told I said on the above Subject. I was called upon, however, soon after this to baptize another Child; when I took the Opportunity of recapitulating what I had before advanced on that Subject. Upon which I was presented with a Series of Letters, written (I find) by the above-mentioned Minister, and which, if they were not likely to fall into the Hands of some who are weak in the Faith, I should treat with that Contempt they deserve; and take no Notice of them. But for the Sake of such, I shall first lay down the Substance of my former Discourse, and then make some Remarks on the above-mentioned Letters.

THE



IN

II

T

dispu
that
the su
be ac
God
ment
exam
ciples
It ru
" all
ever
" nan
" Gh
my se
religi

T H E

INFANT'S CAUSE PLEADED;

OR, THE RITE OF

INFANT BAPTISM DEFENDED.

THE subject of Baptism is doubtless an unessential one. Notwithstanding which there have been, and are now found among us, many unhappy disputes; owing, I presume, to the different opinions that different people entertain in their minds relative to the *subjects, mode and purpose* for which baptism ought to be administered. But a little attention to the word of God will, I apprehend, set us through with the above-mentioned particulars. In order to which let us first examine the *commission* which our Lord gave to his disciples, after his resurrection, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. It runs thus, "*Go teach,*" viz. disciple or proselyte "*all nations;*" that is, persons of every nation wherever your lot shall be cast—" *baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;*" let that be the form of receiving them into my school, or the door of admission into the Christian religion. "*Teaching them to observe all things whatso-*

"*ever I have commanded you:*" that is, instruct them gradually in the grand truths of the gospel—encourage them by its promises, and urge them to a performance of every duty that it contains. From hence then it is evident, that in the *commission* itself we are no more commanded to baptize *believers* than we are children, seeing that neither are particularly mentioned in the above cited passage. Let us therefore now attend to the conduct of the apostles in the discharge of their duty relative to the above *commission*. We are told, Acts viii. 4. that "they went every where preaching "the word." But we have to remark, that the persons to whom the apostles preached were either *heathens*, given up to idolatry*, or *Jews*, who denied that Jesus was the Christ†.

It was therefore necessary that the former should renounce their *idols*, and, with the latter, be brought to confess that *Jesus* was the *Christ*, before they were received into the *school* of Christ, or acknowledged by them as his *disciples*—and were any of the gospel *ministers* now so stationed, they would have a right to look for the same *qualifications*, which I presume they might do, without refusing to baptize the *children* of those parents, who had embraced the Christian religion. This seems to have been the practice of the Jewish *church* of old, whose initiating rite was that of circumcision; for although Abraham, and those of his posterity whose circumcision was omitted in the wilderness, believed previous to their being circumcised, (as appears from Josh. v. 3. compared with Deut. iv. 4. and xxvi. 17, 18.) that was no reason why the *infants*

* Acts xvii. 16.

† John ix. 22.

of such should not be admitted as visible members of the same *church*, by the same rite of initiation. Should any say, that the *children* of the Jews were received into church-membership under that dispensation by express *command*, it is granted; and that command being no where in God's word superseded, but still in force, is one reason why we administer baptism to *infants*. For although the initiating rite under the Christian dispensation is different from that of the Jewish, the *subjects* to whom that rite ought to be administered must remain the same, seeing that we are no where told to the contrary.—Another argument with which we support the rite of *infant* baptism, is contained in Acts xvi. 14, 15. the substance of which is, the apostle preached—Lydia heard—the Lord opened her heart, and she was baptized, and her *household*, or, as the Syriac reads it, *Lydia* and her *children**, which reading is a sufficient reason why the faith of Lydia's *household* is not mentioned in the above cited passage. Now if the apostle baptized whole *households* on the profession and baptism of the parents only; and as *children* (where there are any) always make a part of those *households* to which they belong†, then we proceed in a scriptural manner in baptizing the *children* of such Christian or baptized parents, although they, like the *household* of Lydia, have yet made no profession of their faith in Christ‡. Another argument on which we

* See Burkitt and Dr. Guyse on the above passage.

† Gen. xlv. 18, 19. xlv. 5. 1 Tim. iii. iv.

‡ N. B. Although Lydia was a native of the city of Thyatira, that by no means proves that she and her family had not a settled residence at Philippi.

ground the rite of *infant* baptism is contained in our Lord's own words, in Mark x. 14. where he informs us that "of *such* is the kingdom of God;" so that, if *infants*, dying in that state, are members of the *church* triumphant above, no good reason can be given for denying them that *rite* which denominates them members of the *church* militant below.

The last argument that I shall produce from the word of God in favour of *infant* baptism, is its total silence relative to persons being baptized in *adult years*, who were born of *Christian* or *baptized* parents. This to us is a sufficient proof that the delay of *infant* baptism was not practised in the apostles' days; and, as such an instance as the above cannot be produced from *God's word*, our Anabaptist friends must remain without a scriptural example to support their present practice of *adult baptism*.

I shall now proceed to a few corroborating circumstances from the writings of others, and then dismiss this part of the subject. I shall begin with the testimony of whole churches.—In the 13th article of the church in Saxony, are these words: "We do also baptize *infants*."—In the confession of Wirtemberg, chap. 10. it is said, "We acknowledge that baptism is to be ministered as well to *infants* as to those that are grown to full age."—The confession of Augsbury says, in article 9, that "Young *infants* are to be baptized," &c.—In the confession of the French Protestants, article 35, are these words, "We affirm that *infants*, being born of holy parents, are, by the authority of Christ, to be baptized."—The latter confession of Helvetia, chap. 20, says, We condemn "the *Anabaptists*, who deny that young *infants*, born
" of

“ of faithful parents, are to be baptized.”—The confession of Bohemia, chap. 20. says, “ For these causes “ do our ministers without doubt baptize *children*, in “ the name of the whole Trinity.”—The Dutch confession has these words, article 34, “ We detest the “ error of the *Anabaptists*, who are not content with “ one only baptism, but do also condemn the baptism “ of *infants*; yea, of those that be born of faithful “ parents; but we, by the same reason, do believe “ that they ought to be baptized.”—The Assembly of Divines, in their Lesser Catechism, tell us, that “ Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of “ the visible church, till they profess their faith in “ Christ, and obedience to him; but the *infants* of “ such as are members of the visible church are to be “ baptized.”—And the learned Wall, who took great pains in this enquiry, informs us, that “ from the year “ of our Lord 400, to 1150, no society of men in all “ that period ever pretended to say it was unlawful to “ baptize *infants*.” St. *Austin*, who wrote against *Pelagius*, on original sin, about the year 410, has these words: “ Why are *infants* baptized for the remission “ of sin, if they have none?” This argument puzzled *Pelagius*, as he did not deny *infant* baptism. And when some charged him with denying it, he said, “ Men slander me, as if I denied baptism to *infants*.”—St. *Ambrose*, who wrote about 274 years from the apostles, declares expressly that “ the baptism of *infants* was the practice of the apostles themselves, and “ of the church till that time.” In Cyprian’s time, about the year of our Lord 250, a question was started by *Fidus*, Whether the baptism of *infants* should not

be deferred till the *eighth day* (the old time of circumcision)? Upon which a council of sixty-six bishops was called, who said, "It is our opinion that baptism ought least of all to be refused to a new-born *infant*." And this matter is further confirmed in the second canon of the council of *Carthage*, which consisted of 214 bishops; to whom the same question was started, and to which they gave the same answer. *Origen*, who was born about eighty-five years after the apostles, says, "The baptism of *children* is given for the forgiveness of sin."—And in his comment on the epistle to the Romans, he says, "The church has received a tradition from the apostles to apply baptism even to little *children*."—*Tertullian*, (who lived about the same time) it is true, spoke against *infant* baptism, because he had entertained a notion that sin committed after baptism was next to, if not altogether unpardonable; therefore he advised its delay, (unless in case of necessity) even till after marriage, which is a sufficient proof that it was then in practice.

Proceed we now to the *mode*, another thing about which our Anabaptist friends so warmly contend; a little attention to which will, I hope, set us right in that matter. It is beyond a doubt, I think, that water is the ~~element~~^{ele} to be made use of in this sacrament, as bread and wine ^{are} in that of the Lord's supper. Especially since John says, "I baptize you with water." But the quantity of water, I apprehend, in the former, is no more essential than the quantity of bread and wine is in the latter. To this purpose speaks Bishop Usher, where he says, "As a *spoonful* of wine is as significant as a whole gallon, so is a *handful* of

" of

"of water as significant as a whole river*." Besides, the Greek word *baptizo* signifies, according to the best lexicographers and grammarians, not only to *dip* or *plunge*, but also to *pour on*, or *sprinkle*. Dr. Owen, being conscious of this, says, that "No one instance can be given in the scriptures, where *baptizo* necessarily signifies to *dip* or *plunge*†."---Dr. Guyse tells us, that *baptizo* signifies any sort of washing, and often sprinkling‡.---Dr. Watts says, that *baptizo* signifies to wash any thing by water coming over it.---Bishop Usher tells us, that *baptism* signifies in general any washing§: as also does Brown||, and many others. So that, upon the whole, there seems nothing more required in administering the ordinance of baptism, than that water should be applied to the subject in some form or other, as the mode of use appears to be only the ceremonial part of a positive institution.

But, however, since our Anabaptist friends seem determined to confine the original word to *dipping* or *plunging* only, let us examine the scriptures on that subject, and see which reading will best agree therewith; whether the action of *dipping*, or that of *pouring on*, or *sprinkling*.

Let us begin then with Mark vii. 4. which reads thus: "And when they (that is the Pharisees) come from the market, except they wash" (that is in the

* Body of Divinity.

† Dr. Owen's Sermons, &c. p. 581.

‡ Dr. Guyse, Note on John iii. 6.

§ Usher's Body of Divinity.

|| Brown's Dictionary of the Bible.

original except they are baptized) "they eat not; and "many other things there be which they have received "to hold, as the washing" (or baptizing) "of cups "and pots, brazen vessels, and tables." Now, I think, there is very little probability of the Jews plunging their whole bodies into water before every meal, in order to *wash*, or that their tables were dipped at all for that purpose. Especially since the Jewish washings for purification (it is well known) were ordered to be performed by sprinkling*.

The next passage that I shall take notice of is that in Acts ii. 41. where we are told that "they that "gladly received the apostles' word were baptized; "and the same day there were added unto them about "three thousand souls." Now when I consider that none of these people knew of their conversion when they went from home, and that they were not provided with proper garments; when I consider the danger of their going home in their wet clothes; and the indecency of their being baptized naked, men and women together; when I consider that we are told of but *twelve* men to baptize *three thousand* people; and that all this was performed in one day only, there appears to me no probability at all of their being dipped; but that the ordinance must be performed by some other mode.

Again, if we read Acts ix. we must see that Saul was baptized in the *house* of Judas. And since I read in my Bible of no *river* running through any part of Judas's *house*, nor of any *cistern*, or *bath* there-

* Lev. viii. 11. xiv. 7. Numb. xix. 18.

in, for the purpose of *dipping*, there appears to me no probability of Saul's being baptized in that way.

Similar to this is the case of those on whom the Holy Ghost fell, when Peter was preaching in the *house* of Cornelius, and concerning whom the apostle says, in Acts x. 47. "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." But then there appears to me as little probability of these persons being *dipped* as in the case of Saul, above mentioned; seeing that the ordinance was performed in Cornelius's *house*, and that we read of no place therein that was convenient for that purpose.

Another improbable case is that of the jailer, in Acts xvi. 33. for when I consider the *state* of Paul and Silas's backs, from the stripes which they had but just before received; and when I consider moreover the *time* (viz. at midnight) in which the jailer was baptized, together with its being performed in his own *house*, there appears to me not the least probability of his being baptized by plunging or dipping; especially since we are no where informed of a convenient place in his house for that purpose.

I shall now produce two or three passages in which the word occurs, wherein it is impossible that the action of *dipping* can be understood. It is said in Dan. v. 21. speaking of Nebuchadnezzar, that "his body was *wet*," (viz. washed or baptized, as the word means) "with the dew of heaven." Now I shall leave my reader to judge how it is that a person can be washed or baptized with the dew of heaven, whether

ther by *sprinkling* or *dipping*; though at the same time must confess, that (to me) the former appears natural, but the latter impossible.

The next passage to which I shall refer you is 1 Cor. x. 2. where it is said of the Israelites, that "they were all *baptized* unto Moses in the *cloud* and "in the *sea*." Here the word *baptizo* is used not for *dipping*, but for some other mode of washing: for according to Exod. xiv. 22. "the children of Israel "went into the midst of the sea upon *dry ground*, and "the waters were a wall unto them on the right hand "and on the left." Now how it is possible for persons to be *dipped* into water, and yet remain on *dry ground*, as the Israelites were, I shall leave my reader to determine.

Another passage to which I would direct your attention is Acts i. 5. in which we are informed that "John truly *baptized* with water, but ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Now according to the ideas of our Anabaptist friends, the passage should be read thus: John truly *dipped* you with water, but ye shall be *dipped* with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. Which reading would at once confound the sense of the passage, and destroy the analogy between the baptism of John and that of the Holy Ghost*. This is that (without doubt) on which Mr. Burkitt had his eye fixed when he wrote after the following manner: "As water is *poured upon* "the baptized person, so shall the *gifts* and *graces* of "the Holy Ghost be poured *upon you* not many days

* Matt. iii. 11.

hence;

“hence; which was really accomplished on the day
“of Pentecost†.”

But let us pass on now to examine those passages that are said more particularly to favour the idea of *dipping* or *plunging* under water. One of which you will find in Mark i. 5. where it is said, that “there
“went out unto him (viz. John) all the land of Ju-
“dea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all *baptized*
“of him *in* the river Jordan, confessing their sins.” From hence some have concluded that John certainly baptized by *dipping* or *plunging* under water; but there is no reason to believe that; nor does the word in the original necessarily mean any such thing: for the same word is sometimes rendered *at*, and at other times *with*. So that it might with equal propriety have been rendered, “John baptized *at* or *with* the water of Jordan.” But even supposing that John baptized standing *in the river*, that by no means proves that he *dipped*; seeing that the word is not mentioned in the passage, neither is it necessarily implied. Another circumstance which is thought by some very much to favour the idea of *dipping*, is that of John’s situation at the time of his baptizing. For we are told ‡ that “John was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because
“there was much water there.” But surely John might make choice of a situation of this kind for other purposes beside that of baptizing. But, however, let that be as it may, this we are sure of, that there is not a word of *dipping* mentioned in the above passage, nor

† See Burkitt on Acts i. 5.

‡ John iii. 23.

is it necessarily implied, seeing that the original word signifies to *pour on*, or *sprinkle*, as well as to *dip*.

But some will say, (perhaps) are we not told* that "Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway *out of* the water." We are. But we have to remark, that the Greek word there rendered *out of*, is in many other places rendered *from*†, and might with equal propriety in this. So that the passage might as properly be rendered thus: "And Jesus when he was baptized went straightway *from* the water." But even allowing that Christ came *out of* the water, then all that we know of the matter is that he was *baptized*; and seeing the original word does not necessarily imply *dipping*, no one can say with any degree of certainty that John baptized our Lord after that manner.

Another case which is often called in to the support of baptizing by *immersion*, is that of Philip and the eunuch‡, where we are informed that "they went down both *into* the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he *baptized* him."

But we must observe that the word here rendered *into*, is in Matt. xvii. 27. rendered *to*, where our Lord said to Peter, "Go thou to the sea," &c. so that the passage under consideration might with equal propriety be read thus: "They went down both *to* the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him." But even supposing that they went both into the wa-

* Matt. iii. 16.

† Matt. iii. 7. xi. 25. xxviii. 2.

‡ Acts viii. 38.

ter, what was done there? Why we are told that Philip *baptized* the eunuch. It is not said that he *dipped* him, neither is it necessarily implied, seeing that the original word cannot be restrained in its signification to that *mode* of baptizing.

There are two more passages of which our Anabaptist friends make their boast. Where we are said to be "*buried* with Christ by baptism into death," &c.* Which words are commonly brought as an argument for *dipping* or *plunging* by those who look upon *baptism* to be a sign of the burial and resurrection of Christ. But such persons certainly mistake the apostle's meaning: for, if we observe his words, he does not speak of the burial and resurrection of Christ simply considered, but of our being buried and having risen with him: by which he evidently means our being dead unto sin, and alive unto God, by virtue of the Saviour's death and resurrection. Therefore whosoever they are that are thus dead to sin, and alive unto God, may be said (in the apostle's sense of the words) to be *buried* with Christ. This is effected by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, and of which baptism with *water* is a type or emblem, that represents to our view the nature and necessity thereof.

I shall close this part of the subject by remarking, that there is not a passage in the word of God that requires baptism to be performed by *dipping* or *plunging* the whole body *in* water; nor have our Anabaptist friends a single *example* in the word of God to warrant their present practice of baptizing by that *mode*.

* Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12.

Proceed we now to the purpose for which *baptism* ought to be administered. And first let it be remembered, that it ought not to be administered, as some have asserted, in order “to obtain pardon of sin, the “gift of the Holy Ghost, and eternal happiness.” For whoever is acquainted with the word of God must know that “the *blood* of Christ cleanseth us from all “sin.” Therefore what a pity it is that any man should attribute that to the *water*, which is effected or brought to pass by the *blood* of Christ alone.

That the *gift* of the Holy Ghost does not depend on the administration of this ordinance appears evident; for says Peter, “Can any man forbid water, “that these should not be baptized, who have received “the Holy Ghost as well as we*?” Here the persons spoken of first received the Holy Ghost, and afterwards were baptized.

And that *eternal happiness* does not depend upon it appears clear from the case of the thief upon the cross. For notwithstanding the ordinance of baptism was never administered to him, yet our Lord himself declares, “This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.” Luke xxiii. 43.

Neither ought it to be administered, as some have insinuated, in order “to obtain *peace* of conscience,” since that can be obtained by no other mean than by faith in Christ. For, says the apostle †, “Being justified by “faith, we have *peace* with God, through our Lord “Jesus Christ.”

But then what is the purpose for which *baptism* ought to be administered?

* Acts x. 47.

† Rom. v. 1

I answer, *Baptism* is an ordinance of the gospel, in which the persons baptized are solemnly dedicated to the Lord, initiated into the Christian religion, or school of Christ, and by which they are outwardly distinguished from the *idolatrous Heathens* and *unbelieving Jews*. To this purpose writes the poet, in the following lines:

“ Thus Lydia sanctified her house
 “ When she received the word ;
 “ Thus the believing jailer gave
 “ His household to the Lord.”

DR. WATTS.

It is moreover an emblem of the nature of the work of the Spirit upon a sinner's heart. For “except a man be born of water and of the Spirit,” that is, except the Spirit of God operates upon his *soul*, as water does upon the *body*, in cleansing it from filth, “he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*.”

It also points out to us the absolute necessity of having the conscience sprinkled with the blood of Christ†, without which all the outward washing in the world can never afford us the least degree of solid *happiness*.

It therefore becomes your duty, as parents, to instruct your children, as early as possible, in the principles of the Christian religion, setting forth to them the *fall* of man in Adam, the *recovery* by the *blood* and *righteousness* of Christ, their utter *inability* to help

* John iii. 5.

† 1 Pet. i. 2.

themselves, and the absolute necessity of the *work* of the *Spirit* upon the *heart*, to regenerate, or make them meet for the enjoyment of God. And above all, be careful that “your conversation be as becometh the “gospel of Christ;” always remembering that *actions* speak louder than *words*, and that children, when young, are very apt to become *imitators* of their parents; and if you, by your actions, *build up* the things you attempt to *destroy* by your words, you yourselves become transgressors. Therefore may you be determined, with Joshua of old, “as for *me*, and “*my house*, we will *serve the Lord*.” And, for your encouragement, you are told, that if you “train up “a child in the *way* he should go, when he is old “he will not depart from it.”

Thus, therefore, have I briefly laid before you the substance of my discourse on the above occasion, and shall now proceed to make some remarks on the above-mentioned letters.

SOME

S O M E
R E M A R K S
O N T H E

REV. J. MIDDLETON'S LETTERS.

OUR Author informs us, page 2, that the "Congregation were detained with an harangue for "an hour and a half against the Baptists."

Now the truth is, I was about half that time. And as truth always opposes error, in that sense it may be said to be against the Anabaptists, but in no other. This is the first mistake; which our friend might easily make, seeing he went only by what another told him.

In the above mentioned page we also meet with the following words, viz. "This was no sooner done, "than we were threatened with a second attack."

Now lest my reader should think me too precipitate in this matter, I shall give him my own words, which were these: "On Sunday next (God willing) I shall "baptize another child", and not another word was said.---Alas, what a threaten!

We are told, in page 5, that "the Jewish church "consisted of the whole of that nation, without any "regard to moral qualifications."

This is true with respect to children, but it is not so with respect to adults, as appears from the case of those whose circumcision was omitted in the wilderness;

ness*; for they are said to cleave unto the Lord. They had avouched God to be their God, and he had avouched them to be his people (see Deut. iv. 3, 4. and xxvi. 17, 18.); which sufficiently proves that they were believers, and therefore not without moral qualifications.

Similar to this was the case of the stranger in Exod. xii. 48. where we are told, that if he will keep the passover *to the Lord*, let all his males be circumcised. So that keeping the passover *to the Lord* seems to be the qualification upon which he and his were admitted to church-membership; therefore there does not appear to be so much difference between the Jewish and Christian church as some may imagine.

Our author, in page 6, objects against infant baptism, on account of "the total silence of the New Testament with regard to that matter."

Now the same objection might be brought against admitting women to the *Lord's supper*. But, however, this we know, that church-membership was granted by the Lord to *children* under the Jewish dispensation. The silence, therefore, of the New Testament relative to that matter is a striking proof that he means to continue the same privilege to children under the Christian dispensation: for had he intended an alteration, he would some where or other have told us of it. Therefore as God hath not thought fit to make such an alteration, no man has a right so to do.

In order to overturn that argument for infant baptism supported by the case of Lydia and her household, our friend, in page 7, insists upon it that "the

* Josh. v. 3.

"term *household* does not necessarily include every individual in it." To the support of which he produces 1 Sam. i. 21, 22. where it is said, that "the man Elkanah and all his *house* went up to offer unto the Lord the yearly sacrifice and his vow, *but Hannah went not up;*" the reason for which is contained in the following words. Now can it be supposed that because Hannah and the child *went not up*, that therefore they did not belong to Elkanah's family? Surely not: for a part of his family they still remained, though that action was not performed by them; therefore the term household includes every individual of a family whose residence is in one and the same house. But if *Hannah* and her *child* did not belong to Elkanah's household, if our friend will point out to what family they did belong, he shall have hearty thanks for his pains*.

Our friend, thinking this argument not sufficient, produces another, equally as weak and useless. It is taken from Gen. xlv. 10, 11. where he seems to think that the term household includes some of the animal part of the creation. But if we take notice of verse 11, such a thought (I think) must be immediately banished. It reads thus, "And there will I nourish thee, *lest thou and thy household,*" (viz. you and your family) "and all that thou hast," (viz. your flocks, herds, or animal part of your possession) "come to poverty," or want. Thus hath the Holy Ghost kept up a plain and obvious distinction between the rational and animal part of the creation.

* Our author would do well to remember that there is no BUT to be found in the case of Lydia, as there is in that of Elkanah, for it is said that "she was baptized and her household," *without exception.*

Now

Now these arguments, observe, I do not attribute so much to the weakness of the man, as to that of the cause which he wishes to defend. But I can make no excuse for his saying that I gave up the turning point, namely, *households*, in my second sermon; any more than I can for his denying that he (in his sermon) ranked "the children" among "domestic animals, as cats and dogs." But as I would not wish to render evil for evil, I shall forbear, and proceed to page 8, where we are told, and that without a word of scripture for it, that "Lydia's household consisted of *servants*:" to which I shall only say (in our author's own words) that "when Jehovah speaks by "the scriptures it becomes us to hear; but when he "is silent, let us be so too."

I shall now follow our author to page 10, and take a little notice of Mark xvi. 15, 16. the first of which verses contains the commission of all God's *ministers* to preach the "necessity and nature of the gospel to "every *rational* creature" that will come to hear. But the second describes the character of the persons that will be saved, and of those that will be lost; so that in the 16th verse we are no more commanded to baptize believers only, than we are in Matt. xxviii. 19.

Our friend tells us also, in page 12, "that *infants* "are saved, he believes; but in what manner the divine favour is communicated to them, he knows "not;" at which I am rather surprized: but if he will compare Psalm li. 5. with John iii. 3. and then consider that no soul is regenerated without the operation and graces of the Spirit, he will no longer be at a loss as to that matter. For as there is but one Father

to love them, one Son to redeem them, so neither is there but one Spirit to sanctify or make them meet for the enjoyment of God in glory.

In page 18 our author calls upon me to prove that he misquoted a part of "Calvin's Institutions;" but this I have no business with, seeing that it was not a false quotation of which I accused him, but of breaking the connection; by leaving out the words immediately preceding *those he read*, because they militated against him; observing at the same time, that were we to leave out "the fool hath said in his heart," we might make the scripture say "there is no God."

I shall now follow him to page 20, where he informs us that there is no necessity "to think the three thousand (Acts ii. 41) were all baptized on one day." But if we are under no necessity to believe this plain fact, we are under no necessity of believing any other part of God's word. I grant indeed that it would suit our author much better to have a week allowed for the above purpose; but where the Holy Ghost has mentioned but one day, I have no right to add six more to it.

In the above page we also meet with the following words, "But why think it improbable that Paul was *dipped*, when we know that the two famous rivers Abana and Pharpar ran hard by? To which I answer, because we don't read of his going to either of those rivers; and if he had, he might have been baptized without being dipped. But the truth is, he was baptized in Judas's house, as before observed.

In page 21 our author asks, "Why should it be thought impossible that Nebuchadnezzar was dipped,
"when

"when we consider how copious the nocturnal dews are in hot climates?" I answer, because the Holy Ghost tells us to the contrary. For he was *wet*, viz. washed or baptized with the dew falling upon him from heaven. See Dan. v. 21. To suggest, therefore, the idea of dipping in the above case, is an insult to common sense.

Our friend, however, has one very judicious observation in the above-mentioned page, where he tells us, that in Matt. iii. 11. "John intimates a resemblance between the *manner* in which he baptized, and the *manner* in which Jesus Christ, who came after him, should baptize." So that we have nothing to do but to find out in what *mode* or *manner* Christ baptized with the Holy Ghost, and we shall come at John's *mode* of baptizing with water immediately. In order to do which let us read Acts x. 45. and we shall find that "on the Gentiles also was *poured out* the gift of the Holy Ghost." Now, therefore, since Christ baptized with the Holy Ghost by *pouring on*, and there is a resemblance between his *manner* of baptizing and that of John's, then it must necessarily follow that John's baptism was not performed by the *mode* of dipping, but by that of *pouring on*. Now, therefore, since our author has been so obliging as to prove, by his own assertion, that *ours* is the proper *mode* of baptizing, I shall return him thanks for his kindness, and for the present dismiss the subject.

F I N I S.



s
y
n
t
ls
d
er
to
o-
at
y.
ve
ut
ce
n,
p-
ly
he
w,
to
er
his
l
l
l
l
l